American Jewish Committee

Meeting of the Advisory Council to Dr. Horkheimer

April 7, 1945.

Present:

Nathan W. Ackerman
Solomon E. Asch
Herta Herzog
Max Horkheimer
Philip Klein
Ernst Kris
Paul F. Lazarsfeld
Margaret Mead
Robert K. Merton
Gardner Murphy

Guests:

Bernard Berelson
Warren Brown
Kenneth Clark
Leo Lowenthal
G. Wright Mills
Frederick Pollock

Minutes

I.

The minutes of the previous meeting were approved.

Dr. Horkheimer introduced Dr. Philip Klein as his newly appointed associate in the department.

In reporting on the developments within the department since the last meeting, Dr. Horkheimer announced the completion of a contract with Mr. Gilbert Gabriel for writing the motion picture script. Major Bernard Vorhaus will assist in the writing. It is hoped that the members of the council may receive the first draft of the script within the next few weeks for their suggestions and criticisms.

Apart from its long range studies, the department is called upon by the AJC to estimate the effectiveness of its current educational output, especially its written and radio materials. In this connection a study is being carried on in a shipyard in Camden. At the same time, Drs. Bettelheim and Shils of the University of Chicago are planning a related study of the effectiveness of AJC material with a group of war veterans in a hospital in Chicago.

II.

Dr. Lazarsfeld reported on the Anti-Defamation League project, the aim of which is to study the effectiveness of their propaganda materials which consist of leaflets, radio programs, posters, newspaper releases, pictures and speakers. A mimeographed copy of the proposed investigation is in the

hands of the members of the council. Dr. Lazarsfeld proposed to use the repeated interview technique with special emphasis on the following questions: (1) What persons change in response to the propaganda and which remain unchanged. (2) What features of the propaganda are most effective or least effective ?

Considerable discussion followed, the main points of which are summarized below:

(1) The question was raised concerning the quality of the propaganda to be evaluated. It was pointed out that in order to increase the value of such a study, it would be necessary to insure the use of the best propaganda materials. In short, the suggestion was made that the investigation should not restrict itself to the current propaganda of the ADL but should improve the propaganda to be investigated. In answer to this it was pointed out that the planned investigation would itself throw some light on the problem: which kinds of propaganda are most effective and which are weakest.

(2) An important difference was pointed out between the proposed investigation and related investigations, e.g. election campaigns. In the case of the latter, the campaign culminates in a definite action at a definite date, which is an objective test of the propaganda and which at the same time sets a definite task to the population studied. These characteristics are missing in the proposed investigation. The discussion then centered on the possibility of gearing the investigation to current happenings in the community, such as the treatment of returning Jewish veterans.

(3) It was proposed that a behavior index might be developed to be repeated at stated intervals. If the propaganda were effective with regard to basic trends of the personality, it would show up on such a schedule. It was generally felt that relating the investigation to concrete incidents and decisions would be of great advantage.

(4) A question was raised concerning the possible effects of repeated interviewing. Whereas one can question persons repeatedly about their political opinions, difficulties may be encountered when attitudes toward minority groups are involved. Some may refuse continued cooperation; with others, the repeated interview may itself exert an effect quite aside from the effect of the propaganda proper. In this connection it was suggested that the results of the open interviews should be counterchecked by focused interviews as recently used in other studies on antisemitism.

(5) The need for a control group was also discussed. It was pointed out that two forms of control groups are to be distinguished: (a) a control within the same community with regard to the effect of the repeated interviews; (b) a control group in another community where the ADL propaganda has not reached; (c) a control test at a much later period to guage residual effects.

(6) With regard to the selection of an appropriate community, it was the general opinion that it should include a substantial number of Jewish citizens and that these should also be part of the population studied.

(7) As formulated by Dr. Lazarsfeld, the project confines itself to the investigation of the effects of ADL propaganda upon those members of a community whom it has reached. Here, the point was made that one of the crucial questions concerning such propaganda is whether it succeeds at all in reaching the population. Therefore, the investigation may not confine itself to evaluating the effect of the propaganda when it is heard, read, etc., but must also examine those factors in the propaganda which make it effective or abortive at the start.

(8) One member of the council questioned whether the investigation would get below surface manifestations. The same person who expresses a friendly or indifferent attitude toward the Jews may in a worsening political situation become rabidly antisemitic; while a person critical of the Jewish people may in such a situation oppose excesses. The proposed investigation is likely to miss this process. We would therefore not be in a position to understand how the population studied would act in a changed political atmosphere. The development and use of a behavior index would help to overcome this difficulty.

In answer to the preceding observation, Dr. Lazarsfeld stated that he does not assume propaganda to be effective in a rapidly changing social situation, nor does he assume that propaganda can change the personality structure. At best our study can determine whether the subjects exposed become aware at all of the material, and if so whether they become conscious of its inherent message.

American Jewish Committee

Meeting of the Advisory Council to Dr. Horkheimer

June 2, 1945

Present:

Nathan W. Ackerman
Solomon E. Asch
Herta Herzog
Max Horkheimer
Marie Jahoda
Philip Klein
Ernest Kris
Paul L. Lazarsfeld
Leo Lowenthal
Margaret Mead
Robert K. Merton
Gardner Murphy
Richard Rothschild
John Slawson
Otto Fenichel, Guest

Minutes

I.

Dr. Horkheimer opened the meeting with a report of recent developments within the department. He announced the appointment of Miss Marie Jahoda as his assistant. It will be Miss Jahoda's task to survey the clinical material of Dr. Ackerman's project. She will also assist in duplicating the Berkeley project in New York after observing the work in Berkeley.

Dr. Horkheimer also announced that the childhood study is now beginning at the Child Welfare Institute at the University of California, which is eager to give its cooperation.

Another development reported on by Dr. Horkheimer was that Dr. Berelson might join the department for a time to draft a testing program in the American Jewish Committee in cooperation with the Public Relations Department.

The investigation carried out in one of the shipyards in this region has failed to work out for external reasons. At the time that the investigator was planning to start her interviews, a great number of workers were laid off, creating an unfavorable situation for the investigation.

II.

The meeting then turned to the effect of Nazi atrocity films and their possible value in the work of the Committee. A considerable discussion followed, in the course of which a

certain disagreement developed. Only the essential points will be here summarized.

Many members felt strongly that there was a danger connected with the use of pictures on German atrocities in Jewish defense work. The following were among the main reasons mentioned:

1) Some people revel in the gruesome sights and become more sadistic. On the other hand, if they are shocked, then they cast about for someone upon whom to place the blame and find a victim in the weakest group. A further danger of such pictures is that they tend to increase callousness, when the real problem is to resensitize people to the fact that life is important.

2) It was suggested that most people are shocked in the immediate situation, but that the impression is not long range. The lasting effect may well be the establishment of an associational link between Jews and atrocities.

3) When it was suggested that the films may help people to realize that such things can happen here, and to them, the answer was made that this does not happen in most instances, that generally the atrocities are not tied in with the life of the in-group, but rather referred to out-groups.

In disagreement with the preceding statements, it was suggested that the effect of the films could lead to an increase of belief in their veracity and that this could lead people to the realization that whatever conditions have made them possible must be uprooted.

The possibility of an investigation of the problem was discussed. In this connection, the following points were mentioned:

1) Despite obvious inadequacies, the polling technique might be enlisted to draw a comparison of the reactions to atrocities of groups who have and have not seen the films.

2) It was suggested that the atrocity films need not stress the racial issue exclusively.

3) The effectiveness of the films might be greatly increased if one could show how the victims of the atrocities fought against the Nazis.

Dr. Fenichel remarked that the difficulty in dealing with the problem centers about the tendency to identify themselves either with the victim or with the torturer. Further, the identification may be too close or too weak.

III.

Dr. Lowenstein reported on some psychological mechanisms in antisemitism.

The stereotype thinking concerning Jews may have some basis in reality. The fundamental fact is that the Jewish group has certain unique characteristics which set them off from other groups. Among these may be mentioned:

Physical types of a familiar character
Peculiarities of outward expression
Prevalence of foreign accent
The distribution of Jews in the professions
Emphasis on intellectual matters
Trend to criticisms and irony
Feelings of inferiority
Distribution of neuroses

These differences set the stage for the development of particular attitudes.

Dr. Lowenstein then indicated certain grades of antisemitism which need to be distinguished:

Mere dislike of Jewish behavior, which may not be identical with antisemitism in the usual sense.

The demand that Jews should behave well if antisemitism is to be avoided.

The demand that Jews should be excluded from the country.

Scapegoat and delusional reactions (belief in the protocols of the Elders of Zion).

An interpretation of these reactions on the basis of the mechanisms of projection, displacement and generalization was then developed by Dr. Lowenstein. A discussion of Dr. Lowenstein's paper followed, in the course of which the following points were raised:

1) It was questioned whether the differentiated characteristics of the Jewish group can be regarded as a basis for a hostile attitude and whether such an attitude must not be presupposed in the reaction of differences.

2) The significance of competition between Jews and Gentiles was mentioned as a possible hypothesis.

IV.

In the short time left for the discussion of the motion picture, a number of comments on the script were made. It was agreed that a more detailed discussion on the script would be conducted by Dr. Horkheimer, with the members of the council individually.

A few points were brought out which need further consideration:

1) The soldier and nurse story. The happy ending of this affair might color the perception of the larger event. An unhappy ending, however, might produce frustration.

2) The selection of types ought to be carefully considered. The white collar man, the Negro and the Jew, should either all be unsympathetic or all sympathetic types. They ought to come from the same social strata.

3) The victim of the accident should be a person with whom one can have some sympathy. She ought to be hurt though not killed, otherwise the effect is minimized.

4) To make sure of identification, the Jew ought to be called a Jew and his reaction when accused of a crime should be somewhat more violent.

There was general agreement that the present script was a considerable improvement on the previous one and that only minor alterations need be considered.

American Jewish Committee

Meeting of the Advisory Council to Dr. Horkheimer

June 2, 1945

Present:

Nathan W. Ackerman
Solomon E. Asch
Herta Herzog
Max Horkheimer
Marie Jahoda
Philip Klein
Ernest Kris
Paul L. Lazarsfeld
Leo Lowenthal
Margaret Mead
Robert K. Merton
Gardner Murphy
Richard Rothschild
John Slawson
Otto Fenichel, Guest

Minutes

I.

Dr. Horkheimer opened the meeting with a report of recent developments within the department. He announced the appointment of Miss Marie Jahoda as his assistant. It will be Miss Jahoda's task to survey the clinical material of Dr. Ackerman's project. She will also assist in duplicating the Berkeley project in New York after observing the work in Berkeley.

Dr. Horkheimer also announced that the childhood study is now beginning at the Child Welfare Institute at the University of California, which is eager to give its cooperation.

Another development reported on by Dr. Horkheimer was that Dr. Berelson might join the department for a time to draft a testing program in the American Jewish Committee in cooperation with the Public Relations Department.

The investigation carried out in one of the shipyards in this region has failed to work out for external reasons. At the time that the investigator was planning to start her interviews, a great number of workers were laid off, creating an unfavorable situation for the investigation.

II.

The meeting then turned to the effect of Nazi atrocity films and their possible value in the work of the Committee. A considerable discussion followed, in the course of which a

certain disagreement developed. Only the essential points will be here summarized.

Many members felt strongly that there was a danger connected with the use of pictures on German atrocities in Jewish defense work. The following were among the main reasons mentioned:

1) Some people revel in the gruesome sights and become more sadistic. On the other hand, if they are shocked, then they cast about for someone upon whom to place the blame and find a victim in the weakest group. A further danger of such pictures is that they tend to increase callousness, when the real problem is to resensitize people to the fact that life is important.

2) It was suggested that most people are shocked in the immediate situation, but that the impression is not long range. The lasting effect may well be the establishment of an associational link between Jews and atrocities.

3) When it was suggested that the films may help people to realize that such things can happen here, and to them, the answer was made that this does not happen in most instances, that generally the atrocities are not tied in with the life of the in-group, but rather referred to out-groups.

In disagreement with the preceding statements, it was suggested that the effect of the films could lead to an increase of belief in their veracity and that this could lead people to the realization that whatever conditions have made them possible must be uprooted.

The possibility of an investigation of the problem was discussed. In this connection, the following points were mentioned:

1) Despite obvious inadequacies, the polling technique might be enlisted to draw a comparison of the reactions to atrocities of groups who have and have not seen the films.

2) It was suggested that the atrocity films need not stress the racial issue exclusively.

3) The effectiveness of the films might be greatly increased if one could show how the victims of the atrocities fought against the Nazis.

Dr. Fenichel remarked that the difficulty in dealing with the problem centers about the tendency to identify themselves either with the victim or with the torturer. Further, the identification may be too close or too weak.

III.

Dr. Lowenstein reported on some psychological mechanisms in antisemitism.

The stereotype thinking concerning Jews may have some basis in reality. The fundamental fact is that the Jewish group has certain unique characteristics which set them off from other groups. Among these may be mentioned:

Physical types of a familiar character
Peculiarities of outward expression
Prevalence of foreign accent
The distribution of Jews in the professions
Emphasis on intellectual matters
Trend to criticisms and irony
Feelings of inferiority
Distribution of neuroses

These differences set the stage for the development of particular attitudes.

Dr. Lowenstein then indicated certain grades of antisemitism which need to be distinguished:

Mere dislike of Jewish behavior, which may not be identical with antisemitism in the usual sense.

The demand that Jews should behave well if antisemitism is to be avoided.

The demand that Jews should be excluded from the country.

Scapegoat and delusional reactions (belief in the protocols of the Elders of Zion).

An interpretation of these reactions on the basis of the mechanisms of projection, displacement and generalization was then developed by Dr. Lowenstein. A discussion of Dr. Lowenstein's paper followed, in the course of which the following points were raised:

1) It was questioned whether the differentiated characteristics of the Jewish group can be regarded as a basis for a hostile attitude and whether such an attitude must not be presupposed in the reaction of differences.

2) The significance of competition between Jews and Gentiles was mentioned as a possible hypothesis.

IV.

In the short time left for the discussion of the motion picture, a number of comments on the script were made. It was agreed that a more detailed discussion on the script would be conducted by Dr. Horkheimer, with the members of the council individually.

A few points were brought out which need further consideration:

1) The soldier and nurse story. The happy ending of this affair might color the perception of the larger event. An unhappy ending, however, might produce frustration.

2) The selection of types ought to be carefully considered. The white collar man, the Negro and the Jew, should either all be unsympathetic or all sympathetic types. They ought to come from the same social strata.

3) The victim of the accident should be a person with whom one can have some sympathy. She ought to be hurt though not killed, otherwise the effect is minimized.

4) To make sure of identification, the Jew ought to be called a Jew and his reaction when accused of a crime should be somewhat more violent.

There was general agreement that the present script was a considerable improvement on the previous one and that only minor alterations need be considered.

October 24, 1945.

Professor Gardner Murphy
4 Sussex Avenue
Bronxville, N.Y.

Dear Dr. Murphy :

Enclosed you will find all the material for the meeting on November 3rd. as it has been sent to all Council members. I have been thinking about the procedure some more and would very much like to come back to your kind offer of undertaking the chairmanship for this first meeting. This is why I should like to explain in some detail the items on the agenda. If you feel that you would like a personal discussion on this before the meeting, I should, of course, be delighted to meet you whenever it is convenient to you.

(1) Reorganization of the Work of the Advisory Council

If you agree, I should like to open the meeting, to explain Dr. Horkheimer's absence, to introduce Dr. Flowerman and Mr. Younker, the chairman of the Committee on Scientific Research, who will probably attend this meeting, to explain the idea of a rotating chairmanship, and then ask you to be kind enough to take the chair.

Under item (1) the following matters should then be discussed:

(a) Active participation of the members in the work of the Council through sending in written comments on the material which we shall distribute two weeks before a meeting is to take place. The chairman or the secretary would then open a meeting with a summary report on these comments.

(b) It might prove advantageous to keep the number of Council members small for certain discussions and therefore the American Jewish Committee reserves the right to invite occasionally

only some of the members for a discussion. The selection would, of course, be made entirely according to special interests of the various Council members.

(c) A review of present membership of the Council and suggestions, if any, for adding one or two people.

(2) Report on Progress

I shall have prepared for the meeting a summary statement on all projects. It seems, however, unadvisable to discuss every project in detail. If the members of the Council so desire, they could have one or the other item for detailed discussion put on the agenda for a future meeting. In this progress report I shall also mention our newest venture, the establishment of a testing unit within the Scientific Department.

(3) Study of Anxiety and Social Aggression among War Veterans

Fortunately Dr. Bettelheim will be in New York on November 3rd and I, therefore, suggest that he introduces the discussion in a short talk of not more than ten minutes. As you will see from the enclosures there is ample material forthe members to form a view of the procedure envisaged for this investigation.

(4) Testing of Educational Material

The Bureau of Applied Social Research has just been completing an investigation of the enclosed three propaganda items and I have asked Dr. Lazarsfeld to introduce a discussion by describing the methods applied and formulating some tentative conclusions on the value of that type of investigation for the work of the Committee.

I am not quite clear whether we should decide on the chairman for the next meeting on Saturday. I have the feeling that the selection ought to depend on the agenda which we have, of course, not yet worked out for the meeting in December. As long as we get the agreement of the members to serve occasionally as chairman, I feel we are safeguarded. But if you think it advisable to select a chairman right-a-way , this procedure would probably come at the end of the meeting on Saturday. I might add that I have talked to Drs. Merton, Lazarsfeld and Mead and have got their agreement to serve as chairman whenever we need them.

May I thank you very much for your kind cooperation.

Sincerely yours,

Marie Jahoda

ADVISORY COUNCIL TO THE SCIENTIFIC DEPARTMENT OF THE AJC

MEETING: November 3, 1945.

Present:

Dr. Marie Jahoda
Dr. S. Flowerman
Gardner Murphy
Margaret Mead
Robert K. Merton
Ernst Kris
Rodolphe Lowenstein
Nathan W. Ackerman
Paul F. Lazarsfeld
Dr. John Slawson
Leo Lowenthal
Bruno Bettelheim
Dr. Bateson (as guest)

Notes for Minutes

Jahoda:
Dr. Horkheimer is prevented from being with us today, he does not feel well and, upon doctor's orders, had to return to California for a complete rest. This absence makes us even more aware of our need of the work of the Council and we want to draw upon it as fully as we can. We shall consider various ways in which to do this. Our task is now to continue the work of the Department and to guarantee the same high standards in our research work.
Our first problem is the re-organization of this Council. Dr. Horkheimer used to be the chairman and we believe that it might be a good idea to have, during his absence, a rotating chairmanship of the members. This would involve a certain amount of work for the members before the meeting together with the permanent secretary (Jahoda) and the directing of the meetings proper. Dr. Murphy was good enough to consent in taking the chair for this meeting.

Dr. Murphy takes over chairmanship.

Murphy:
Introduces Gregory Bateson as guest.
The first point today upon which informal agreement has been reached is the more active participation of the members through written comments on material sent out by the Department prior to the meetings.
The problem is: should we not also be given together with the material a list of specific questions upon which to make definite comments ?

Jahoda:
This is what we have in mind for the future. This meeting is sort of in-between in order to settle these technical questions. We shall want to have as detailed comments as we possibly can get, draw on your experience with respect to methods, discussion of concepts we apply in

our research, detailed criticism and suggestions, detailed comments on our methodical approach to our specific studies.

Murphy:
In discussing unexplored difficulties, I would suggest that we ask everybody a series of specific question and then iron them out in discussion of disagreements.

Jahoda:
It would probably depend on the subject.

Mead:
Have a combined method of individual comments and clearing differences.

Merton: Give a line of specific questions and leave ample space and time for individual comments.

Mead:
There should also be a statement on the actual state of such research, whether a project is three years old or in progress etc.

Murphy:
Point 2 of the agenda: Keep number of members small. The selection is naturally up to the AJC. Review present members of Council and possible addition of new ones. Shall we all just mention persons or appoint a small Committee to make suggestions ?

Ackerman:
Depends on what kind of person is missing in the group now with regard to the fields of interest covered.

Bettelheim:
These questions are really interdependent. If you invite members from the Council for specific problems it might be good to have a large Council to draw upon as kind of a rooster.

Kris:
The selection obviously depends on the nature of the project discussed. I would propose to determine the personnel policy according to the task at hand.

Jahoda:
I think, a social economist is missing in our group now. Our aim is to get from every Council meeting different answers to different questions and we feel that this can be best achieved with only three or four people at a time. Thus, the selection would have to be connected with the subject in question. This also would solve the selection of the rotating chairman for the various meetings.

Mead:
I think it would be more valuable to discuss categories rather than names and then refer the names to a small sub-committee for discussion. It may be necessary, but I don't really see why all panel members must be members of the actual council. Could we not have a standing Council with a certain number of people who can come in when necessary ?

Flowerman:
The discussion of today's meeting might help to solve this problem. Let's discuss this at the end of the agenda today.

Murphy: agrees.
Dr. Jahoda will give us a summary statement on the projects in progress.

Jahoda:
Personnel developments:
(1) Dr.Flowerman, introduced as the associate director of the Sc. Dept, is head of the department and Dr. Horkheimer as well as we all felt fortunate to have him at this very moment of Dr. Horkheimer's absence.
(comments on F.'s qualifications)
(2) Knuper
(3) Gouldner dto.

(Districution of list of Projects)

All these projects are major projects, the list gives roughly the problem, methods, time involved, cooperative agencies, directors and place of work.
I think, we should not discuss these projects in detail now. You are more or less familiar with them through your work during the past and they will come up in detail in later sessions. This is just as a reference as to what is going on in the Department now.

Testing:
The AJC does not only want results of the long-range projects but also action as advisory function to the output of the Committee's educational material. Large-scale testing has been done for us by the Bureau of Applied Social Research in the past. But we have also items which we can test out with 3-4 field workers in a short time, that is, before going into large-scale testing. We therefore founded the Testing Unit. Example of a test:

The question is: how many children are, by their education, conditioned to persecution ?
When a child asks the mother: What is a Jew? - we want to analyze these answers and find out what the image or stereotype of the Jew is.

Bettelheim:
I would not have the slightest idea what to answer to such a question from a child.

Ackerman:
One could not ask this question until the problem has come up for the child through some external incident.

Jahoda:
We are only really just trying out the goodness of this approach. This will show you that we do not intend to set up a small competition to large organizations. We just want to try out new methods and experiment with new approaches to the material of the AJC.

Example: what happens to the content of an item of educational material when it is passed on from one person to another ?

We hope that the Unit is going to give us a lot of new ideas of methods, we shall also use it for limited work in connection with our own projects and it will be of help to the Public Relations Department of the AJC.

Murphy:
Anyquestions with regard to the list of projects ?

Lowenstein: (returning to problem of first example) Would the Jewish parents be tested in different categories (religious)?

Flowerman:
Yes. We try to find that out too.

Murphy:
In the list of projects before us there is an extraordinary emphasis on diagnosis and nothing on therapy.

Lowenstein: I think this is rather natural to first try to find out and then think of therapy.

Mead:
I think we spend too much time in studying the people who have the disease and not enough with those who are not or least contaminated. Find out about the people who think otherwise. Then get a basis for therapy.

Bettelheim:
In our specific study (War Veterans), although the sample is very small, we have not yet found anybody who was not somehow contaminated. Dr. Horkheimer also raised this question in discussions but so far we have not yet come across this other kind.

Merton:
Maybe that depends on the selection of your sample ? From the sample, however, you can take those cases of least contamination for further study.

Jahoda:
We aredoing this in the Berkeley study. With the help of our questionnaire we get those who are high and those who are low on antisemitism and then study both sides with clinical methods as discussed previously.

Mead:
In the phrasing of all these questions the word antisemite is always taken for granted. This has never been discussed. I propose to put on the agenda for the next meeting: A real discussion of what we think we are studying and not take a cliche for granted.

Kris:
I support this point.
Also, if we talk about therapy: "existing differences in people". This is the pitfall of therapeutic methods. People tend to deny the existence of actual differences !

Ackerman: The question is also the acceptance and tolerance of differences. Pursuit of diagnosis also lights up the therapeutic aspect. It only gets more involved when relatively "normal human beings" are involved. In mass techniques of therapy then the actual methods are going to be directed against mixed groups of people. Therefore small experimental samples are good to test out methods for future mass-application.
Also: "The less specific the technique, the smaller the result will be."
Can we reach certain common denominators ?

Murphy:
I thought simply of a distinction among antisemites in positive and negative terms. May we not regard antisemitism as a "deficiency" in democracy instead of a particular pathological state ?

Mead:
If we could find the people who come up highest to the ideal of the democratic behavior and then discuss and find out what put them there, we may discover ways of therapy for others.
To assume antisemitic as a pathological state is not scientific.

Lowenstein:
If one assumes that there is a kind of normal low-grade antisemitism, they are obviously pathological.

Merton: Administrative point: e.g. what would be the translation of such a discussion as here now for the work of the Scientific Department ?

Murphy:
Perhaps we should appoint at the end of the meeting a small committee for such tasks.

WAR VETERANS STUDY

Bettelheim:

To Dr.Shils and myself it never occurred to study antisemitism per se. Our interviews last from 3-7 hours. I cannot read such an interview to you now. Only about 10 minutes are devoted to antisemitism as such. We first introduce the Negro, the Japanese and displaced persons in Europe in our interviews. -- The idea which guided us was in terms of therapy. Antisemitism is an ethic phenomenon;it is connected with other features of the person. It is one expression of aggression and aggression is quite frequently the result of anxiety.
(a) Which might become the most significant group in shaping the future of the country ? We decided that the veterans would be this most likely.
(b) What are the outmost fears and anxieties in this group, and to what consequences for society might they lead ?

Our study is so far only a preliminary one. We restricted ourselves to enlisted men. Otherwise the structure of the instrument would have to be quite different. The experiences of the officers are naturally different from those of the enlisted men.

Sample:List of names from the Chicago Sun. Used to be pro New Deal (Yank Service Bureau). We might later go to the Mayor's Committee which covers the entire field of veterans. The advantage of the Yank Bureau is that there the veterans are anyway submitted to an extensive interview and we thus get a lot of background material on the subject.

We still feel that our questionnaire is too long and I would appreciate suggestions from this council as to the shortening of the interview. Our interviewers are psychiatric social workers whom we found most successful. We really try to establish correlations between variables and racial discrimination. Toward the University we had to oblige ourselves to study racial discrimination and not only antisemitism. If the AJC does not feel that it could sponsor such a study, I would like to know frankly because otherwise we would have to discontinue. We feel that antisemitism is just part of racial discrimination. We also test the material of the AJC. We hope to come out with very definite results: how they respond to our questionnaire, how they would respond after having beenexposed to the material of the AJC.

Ackerman:
Is this a single interview, just one occasion ?

Bettelheim:
Yes. We found that it is not good to break it. The interviewer makes the subject as familiar as possible and as much as possible at home. The subjects are not paid.

Flowerman:
Selection: Do we know anything about the man who does not want to participate ?

Bettelheim:
We don't, except from what the agency tells us. It is mostly that the veterans do not want to meet strange people.

Lazarsfeld:
It might be good to have records as close as possible on those people who do not want to participate.

Bettelheim: (answering Dr. Slawson)
The interviewers are all white Gentiles. We found it safer to do this.

(Here follows a long citation of quotes from a specific case).

Murphy:
Would the University of Chicago object to use the phrase of "Religious and Racial Discrimination" to perhaps broaden the concept ?

Mead:
With regard to the questionnaire of the W.V.Study: there is nothing about religion.
The Category of Religion should go on the face sheet !

Bettelheim:

Gives outline and purpose of entire study.

We try to study fear and expectation of future deprivations.
also: Deprivation in childhood
Character of religious training
Deprivation through being drafted
Deprivation in Army
Deprivation after having left the Army.

Our experience is that the veteran will only talk freely when he has been out of the army for at least one week.

Our neurotic cases we get from the clinics and agencies.

The material so far suggests plenty of insight and should be followed up closely.

Those veterans who come from a minority group seem to be aggressive to outer-minorities.

It is our plan to get the types of responses to the material of the AJC and then generalize. Our generalizations so far are entirely based on the few cases we have had up to now.

Murphy:
Written comments to this presentation and the entire study should be submitted by the members and directed to Dr. Jahoda for transmission to Dr.Bettelheim.

Mead:
Dr. Dix (?) has found that attitude toward the future is the most accurate of distinguishing between various Nazis.

Bettelheim:
Shils worked closely with Dix. The question was developed in this context.

Ackerman:
Is there any part in the interview that gives information about the veteran's awareness of common ground with the interviewer ? Does the veteran know that the interviewer is non-Jewish, does he feel that he belongs to the same group as the interviewer ?

Bettelheim:
Yes and no. I don't see how that can be done in all cases.

Lazarsfeld:
In our interviews we usually find that sooner or later the respondent asks the interviewer whether he is Jewish ?! We counteract this with the question by the interviewer , that is, returning the question .

Bettelheim:
Our interviewers encourage the statement from the subjects to what religious denomination he belongs.

Ackerman:
You encourage a positive relationship to the interviewer and then you ask for his gripes ! These are two aspects which may interfer with each other.

DR. LAZARSFELD'S REPORT ON TESTING.

Lazarsfeld:

My group is most interested in the testing of the AJC's material. Most of the studies are concerned with basic attitudes.

There are four questions to be answered:
1) Whether the material reaches at all the people to whom it is addressed,
2) Do those who get it understand it,
3) In what way is the material assimilated,
4) What final effect would it have ?

The fourth question we have not dared to attack yet.

Story of Labor

We used Detroit and tried to find out whether people read it (Union members who get the paper). When we spotted the people who actually read it, we

pick 25 items in the paper and ask: have you noticed it, have you started reading it, and have you finished it ? The main problem is to find out howt this material is read in comparison with other kind of material, not just whether or not it is read. Only about 6% of the organization's workers are reached, but within this group the Labor Study stands out quite well.

This is just a typical study of the coverage which should be repeated at intervals; one study alone cannot vive very much. It is interesting, however, that the actual reading of the cartoon is not related to the liberal or non-liberal viewpoints of the subjects.

Ghost Goes West.

Here we are not interested in coverage but only to find out whether and in how far it is understood.
Try to get a kind of scale of understanding reaching from
a) completely understood
b) substantial understanding
c) mixture of confusion, miscomprehension, don't know
d) boomerang effect (it is put out by people who want to discriminate against Jews).

Results: 43% understand it
17% boomerang effect
40% confused.

Again: one study is not enough. When you have done 4-5 such studies you will know whether 40% means a good or poor percentage.

The boomerang effect is twice as high with educated people than with grade school people, on the other hand, education does not seem to increase the actual understanding.

Mr. Bigott.

3 cartoons were picked. Problem to get at the psychological processes by which the material was interpreted. We try to see what happened. Long interviews and case studies.

High educated people who do not understand are obviously not too stupid to understand, they would have psychological problems which prevent them from understanding and we found that they are usually more prejudiced than others.

Then we try to find out by what self-argument do these people try to discount the message in order not to bring it in contradiction with one's own prejudice.

(In answer to Lowenstein) Whether boomerang or not-understanding is highly a question of the level of education. The boomerang effect depends on the material. The less ambiguous the material, the smaller the boomerang effect. The content of the material can facilitate the discounting or vice versa.

Mead:
Do you give the subjects really a good chance in terms of time to see and understand the material ?

Lzarsfeld:
Yes. The interview lasts from 1-1½ hours and the 3 cartoons are shown in intervals of ½ hour. The understanding goes up with the second cartoon and the discounting sets in with the 3rd cartoon when the message is fully understood.

Mead:
A correlation of evaluation whether the Mr. Bigott is funny and the understanding would be most interesting.

Murphy:
Our time is nearly up and we still have two major questions to clear. All comments should be cleared through Dr. Jahoda's office. What about the setting up of a sub-committee for clearing problems and discussions ?

Jahoda :
We are committed to the studies which are now in working. Even if additional studies can be suggested, we must get the best out of the studies we have now started. Perhaps postpone the discussion of new approaches to a moment when we feel we can engage in them.

Mead:
My suggestion was not to get new approaches but to arrive now first at a frame of reference. If we want to be useful in the evaluation of our present studies, we should certainly arrive at such a frame of reference.

Merton:
I think if there would be definite assignments as to comments on the projects now in progress, it might be of greater use to all of us.

Kris: Has the work of the Council been of use so far ?

Merton:
I would say that the suggestion of the AJC for written statements and comments infers the intention to make better use of us in the future. There should be some focus on the precise problems in projects now in progress as Dr. Mead suggested to be discussed in smaller groups.

Bettelheim:
If the group does not have a common frame of reference I do not know how they can work together. It might be better to have a smaller council elected and then present to the larger group a draft what might later become a common frame of reference.

Ackerman: In fairness to Dr. Horkheimer we must not forget that he gave us a frame of reference. Perhaps this should be re-stated here now. Perhaps Dr. Jahoda can do this for us.

Murphy:
I don't think we can expect that at this moment from Dr. Jahoda. I wonder whether she could do two things, though:
1) formulate a first draft of the general frame of reference in which the research should proceed.
2) give a statement of the specific role which the council should fulfill , in what way we can be helpful.

Jahoda:
This might be very good. We think we have got a frame of reference and it would not be too difficult to put this on paper, either for a small group or a council meeting.

Flowerman:
For the first time we have a complete staff. The first year was largely a preparation. The council was sort of a sounding board. Now we have to work out a way in which the council can actually be used.

Murphy:
Perhaps, then, this formation of a small group should wait until Dr. Jahoda has given such a statement.

Jahoda:
I suggest for the next meeting a discussion of the general concept and the frame of reference. For that purpose, maybe the Department should have its say and afterwards form a group.

Murphy:
Why not also send out before the next meeting a list for possible future members and ask us for written comment on them. As for today's discussion, specific comments on Dr. Bettelheim's project would be most welcome and should be sent in to the Department.

Meeting closes.

ADVISORY COUNCIL TO THE SCIENTIFIC DEPARTMENT OF THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE

Meeting Saturday, November 3, 1945, 3:00 p.m.

AGENDA:

(1) Reorganization of the Work of the Advisory Council

(2) Report on Progress

(3) The Study of Anxiety and Social Aggression Among War Veterans *

(4) Testing of Educational Material: *

"Mr. Bigott"
"The Ghosts Go West"
"The Story of Labor"

MINUTES

AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE MEETING OF THE SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY COUNCIL

November 3, 1945

Present:

Nathan W. Ackerman
Gregory Bateson (as guest)
Bruno Bettelheim
Samuel Flowerman
Marie Jahoda
Ernst Kris
Rodolphe Lowenstein
Leo Lowenthal
Paul F. Lazarsfeld
Margaret Mead
Robert K. Merton
Gardner Murphy
John Slawson

Minutes

Dr. Jahoda opened the meeting explaining Dr. Horkheimer's absence and suggesting that a reorganization of the work of the Scientific Advisory Council, was indicated. In the course of a discussion, it became clear that most members of the Council felt that their services had not been sufficiently utilized and would welcome a reorganization that gave them a more active part in the work of the Department. The point was raised that in case the Scientific Department wished to use the Council as a group, a common framework of reference ought to be worked out. However, other contributions to the discussion suggested that the best possible use of the members of the Scientific Advisory Council would be made by using them as individual consultants to certain projects rather than, as a group discussing general questions. It was left to the secretary of the Council to present a frame of reference at a suitable moment or to clarify otherwise, the needs and wishes of the Department in respect to cooperation with the members of the Scientific Advisory Council.

A brief report on progress of the Department was given mainly in terms of added personnel.

Dr. Bettelheim reported on some aspects of his study on war veterans, presenting a detailed account of one interview. A number of discursive suggestions on methodology were made and a few questions as to the procedure he adopted, were raised. The meeting did not, however, go into a comprehensive discussion of this investigation.

Dr. Lazarsfeld reported on three investigations of AJC propaganda material which the Bureau of Applied Social Research is carrying out for the Department. ~~The results were noted with interest.~~

~~The meeting adjourned to an unspecified date.~~

MJ:EE
12/7/45

11/5/45

RE: SCIENTIFIC ADVISORY COUNCIL

The Scientific Advisory Council as presently constituted, and as presently used, is of ~~very little~~ limited value to the Scientific Department.

Last Saturday's meeting quite well illustrates the futility of expecting anything constructive to come out of meetings of the entire group. In fact open hostility toward the overall program of the Department was evident.

The following suggestions are made in order to effectuate the kind of expert consultation the Scientific Department needs:

(1) Name of the Scientific Advisory Council should be changed to BOARD OF CONSULTANTS

(2) Individual consultants should be activated at the will of the Scientific Department. This means that there will be individuals who are members of the Board of Consultants and whose services will not be used at all times.

(3) Consultants should be used for specific purposes. Perhaps they can be used in relation to specific projects or specific areas of operation. To cite an example: -- A consultant who is a propaganda specialist ~~may~~ might be used for advice in connection with our testing program. Another individual who is a specialist in test construction and advanced statistics might be used in connection with certain phases of the Berkely project. A consultant who is a specialist in the field of art might be used in ~~connection with~~ for psychology 1 our two art projects.

(4) Active consultants would be paid an honorarium of $50.00 per month, not $50.00 a meeting. However, for this honorarium they would be expected to give a certain amount of service which would be carefully defined. They would be expected to meet once or twice with members of the staff of the Scientific Department. ~~They will be expected~~ would meet once or twice a month

with other consultants at meetings called by the Scientific Department. They would also be expected on several occasions during the month to make critical comments in writing in response to specific inquiries originating in the Scientific Department.

(5) The so-called "frame of reference" of the Scientific Department would be clearly enunciated in writing for distribution to the present members of the Council to make it clear to them that we are committed for the ~~moment~~ time being to a specific program and to specific projects which must be carried through to a greater stage of completion before any new projects are considered. Of course, we shall be interested in problems of therapy and in sociological studies, but this is a question of orientation which must be answered initially by the Scientific Department, and cannot be left to determination by the Scientific Advisory Council.

If such a determination is permitted to be freely discussed in the Scientific Advisory Council, and if the Scientific Department then finds it necessary to deviate from the will of the Scientific Advisory Council difficulties are certain to follow.

Provision for occasional full meetings of the Board (once or twice a year).